

## II. REMARKS

### A. Introduction

In this Action claims 1-16 are noted as pending, pursuant to 37 CFR Section 1.145 and MPEP Section 821.03 the applicant is required to elect an invention, and claims 1-10, 14 and 15 are rejected based on prior art.

In this Response, the Specification is amended to a minor extent, claims 11-13 and 16 are non-elected and withdrawn, claims 1-10, and 14-15 are amended, and remarks are provided.

### B. Requirement for Election

Applicant elects claims 1-10, 14 and 15. Claims 11-13 and 16 are withdrawn.

### C. Rejections of Claims 1-10, 14 and 15

These claims are rejected as being made obvious by a combination of Nakamura Japanese Patent No. 405100864A, and Gan et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,878,238.

For the following reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention, as recited by amended claims 1-10 and 14-15 herein, was not rendered obvious by the cited combination.

According to the present invention, a device 10 decodes (translates) a program, judges whether or not an address described in the decoded program is effective, and, when the address is not effective, re-writes (changes) the address in the decoded program into an effective address based on the label of the program in an exception handling. See, e.g., page 8, lines 4-27, page 9, page 10, lines 1-14 of the present application. In this way, the next time the program won't have to acquire the address again from the label – it is already in the program. This speeds processing.

Thus, the present invention recited by these claims includes the following features: (A) judging whether or not an address described in the decoded program is effective; and (B) re-

writing (changing) an address in the decoded program into an effective address by the exception handling, when the address described in the decoded program is not effective.

Nakamura and Gan et al. do not teach or suggest these features.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Nakamura does not teach exception handling. Nevertheless, Gan et al. is cited for teaching same. However, Gan et al. relates to when an incompatible or "semi-compliant" video card is used with a PC, i.e., is put in the wrong slot. Instead of the video card being totally unusable, the PC detects the incompatible video card (see, e.g., Col. 2, lines 66-67 and Col. 4, lines 1-16), and any attempted write cycle to an address in the VGA address space results in the execution of an "exception handler".

More particularly, the option ROM of the video card is activated and the I/O address space thereof is read. An address look up table is also generated. A determination is then made as to whether the address of the write cycle is part of the address space of the card as specified in the look up table. If not, the bridge is remapped to handle the address. The cycle is forwarded to the video card, the card is initialized and the bridge is remapped to its original mapping. A return from this exception handling is then executed. In this way, the video card may be initialized and used to instruct the user, via a displayed message, only that the video card should be moved to another slot, before the PC can be used further. See Col. 4, lines 14-51.

Thus, at most, when an incorrectly installed video card is detected, Gan et al. teaches going to a pre-set group of addresses, and an appropriate address is selected and executed to allow the video card to operate to a limited extent to advise the user that the card must be moved to a more appropriate slot in order to properly function.

Gan et al. does not, like Nakamura does not, teach the above-described recited judgment of whether the address is effective and, if ineffective, re-writing the label as an effective address directly into the program.

### III. CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that 1-10 and 14-15 claims are now in condition for allowance.

If there any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Application No. 09/502,791  
Response Dated December 8, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of July 7, 2003  
Page 12

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Response, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.


Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

12/8/03

By: \_\_\_\_\_



William F. Herbert  
Registration No. 31,024

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 434-1500



FIG. 1

